Digital Parcel Map Improvement Project
Vendor Questions and Answers
As of April 5, 2016

Question:
 Would mapping in the Parcel Fabric be acceptable for this response?
Answer:
Proposals should include data delivery in the same format as the sample data so it can be inserted into our current data schema. We would consider other alternatives.

Question:
 Is the sample database provided the exact database that will be updated?
Answer:
 Yes, the example was a clip from our countywide geodatabase.

Question:
 Are the 'arcode' and 'webcode' attributes on the parcel geodatabase the only attributes that will need to be set?
Answer:
Yes, once the arcode attribute is updated we can supply a SQL statement to do a bulk update of the webcode.

Question:
Are there any topology requirements that the parcel and zoning feature classes need to meet?
Answer:
The parcel lines (parelln) parcel polygons (parcelpy) and zoning polygons (zoningpy) should be edge matched. However, there are some exceptions. A parcel line feature called Meander/old lot lines/easements are generally not the current parcel or zoning polygon boundaries, but we do map and display them to help us understand legal description references to old lots, blocks etc. Road center lines would be another exception to edge matching.

Question:
 Is there a set of standards for what content should be in the annotations?
Answer:
Yes, we don't envision a lot of changes needed to the annotation, but corrections to should be applied. The annotations were designed originally to fit the 1 inch = 100 feet and 1 inch = 400 feet on levels in ArcInfo coverages. They are currently stored feature classes pcl100an, pcl400an and pclmixan. We can provide a more detailed annotation listing in the geodatabase format to assist editing. The annotation layer names in the sample data correspond to the Level column in the table below.

Annotation Layer Levels

LEVEL	DESCRIPTION	SCALE
1	LOCAL ROAD NAMES	1"=400
2	MAJOR LAKES AND RIVERS	1"=400'
2	MINOR LAKES AND RIVERS	1"=400'
3	FORMER ROAD NAMES	1"=400'
4	CO. STATE FED HWY NAMES & RR	1"=100
4	CO. STATE FED HWY NAMES & RR	1"=400
5	LOT NUMBERS	1"=400
5	LOT DIMENSIONS & ROWS & ANNEX	1"=400'
6	LOT DIMENSIONS & ROWS & ANNEX	1"=100'
6	LOT NUMBERS	1"=100'
7	FORMER ROAD NAMES	1"=100'
8	LAST 5 DIGITS OF PARCEL NUMBER	1"=400'
9	LAST 5 DIGITS OF PARCEL NUMBER	1'=100'
10	MAN. FOREST LAW & WTL	1"=400'
10	GOV'T LOTS	1"=400'
11	MAJOR LAKES & RIVERS	1'=100'
11	MINOR RIVERS & BAYS	1'=100'
11	STREAMS	1"=100'
12	MAP HOOKS (COMMON OWNERSHIP)	1"=100'
14	SUBDIVISION BLOCK NUMBERS	1"=100'
14	SUBDIVISION INDEX NUMBERS	1"=100'
14	SUBDIVISION BLOCK BOX	1"=100'
15	ADDRESS NUMBERS	1"=400'
16	ADDRESS NUMBERS	1"=100'

Question:
 Will you be supplying road center line features with road name attributes or is the contractor digitizing and or cogo this data in?
Answer:
The contractor would be expected to update the parcel centerlines based on surveys and other data where needed. We can supply a centerline feature class with road name attributes based on road pavement, but it would be for informational purposes only.

Question:
Will multiple remote users be available to the contractor and will they have the ability to print.
Answer:
Multiple users can be provided to surveys deeds etc. and they will be able to print as needed.

Question:
Why January 1, 1955 for COGO method on surveys, plats, etc. that were done after that date.
Answer:
1955 was the first year Wisconsin required land surveyors to be licensed. The quality of surveys before that time varies widely.

Question:
Is the "surface water boundaries" supplied in LIDAR form? Will it have named attributes?
Answer: The boundaries were derived from a 2005 LIDAR project. Lake, river and creek polygons will have name attributes. Single line streams features will not have attributes, but annotation will be supplied for them.

Question:
Will the awarded contractor be awarded the remaining parcels without going through another RFP selection?
Answer:
No commitments can be made for future years at this time. The county plans on applying for a $50,000 grant for this same purpose in 2017, but it will require County Board approval. Current purchasing policies require a competitive selection process that may include another RFP for 2017.